1	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
2	DISTRICT OF MASSACHUSETTS (Boston)
3	No. 1:20-cr-10098-WGY-4
4	
5	UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
6	
7	VS.
8	
9	VERONICA ZEA
10	
11	* * * * * * *
12	
13	For Hearing Before:
14	Judge William G. Young
15	Sentencing
16	
17	United States District Court District of Massachusetts (Boston.)
18	One Courthouse Way Boston, Massachusetts 02210
19	Thursday, November 3, 2022
20	****
21	
22	REPORTER: RICHARD H. ROMANOW, RPR
23	Official Court Reporter United States District Court
24	One Courthouse Way, Room 5510, Boston, MA 02210 bulldog@richromanow.com
25	

```
APPEARANCES
1
 2
 3
    SETH B. KOSTO, ESQ.
       United States Attorney's Office
       One Courthouse Way, Suite 9200
 4
       Boston, Massachusetts 02210
       (617) 748-3230
 5
       E-mail: Seth.kosto@usdoj.gov
 6
       For the United States of America
 7
8
    FRANK R. UBHAUS, ESQ.
       Berliner Cohen, LLP
9
       Ten Almaden Boulevard, Eleventh Floor
       San Jose, California 95113-2233
10
       (408) 286-5800
       Email: Frank.ubhaus@berliner.com
11
       for the defendant
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

```
PROCEEDINGS
1
           (Begins, 12:30 p.m.)
 2
           THE CLERK: Criminal matter 20-10098, the United
 3
     States of America versus Veronica Zea.
 4
 5
           THE COURT: Good morning counsel, or good
     afternoon. Would counsel identify themselves, starting
 6
     with the government.
8
           MR. KOSTO: Assistant United States Attorney Seth
     Kosto on behalf of the government, your Honor. Good
 9
10
     afternoon.
11
           THE COURT: Good afternoon.
12
           MR. UBHAUS: And Frank Ubhaus on behalf of
     Veronica Zea, who is present.
13
           THE COURT: And good afternoon to you both.
14
15
           May I talk to her directly about the presentence
16
     report?
17
           MR. UBHAUS: Absolutely.
           THE COURT: Ms. Zea, have you read the presentence
18
19
     report that's been prepared in your case?
20
           THE DEFENDANT: Yes.
21
           THE COURT: Have you talked it all over with your
     attorney?
22
23
           THE DEFENDANT: Yes.
           THE COURT: Do you think you understand it?
24
25
           THE DEFENDANT: Yes.
```

THE COURT: Thank you.

Nothing's been withheld from the presentence report under the rules of criminal procedure?

PROBATION OFFICER: No, your Honor.

THE COURT: Very well.

This is a sentencing pursuant to 18 United States

Code Section 3553(a). Sentencing in this session of the

court really involves four steps and the first three are

largely arithmetical. I calculate the highest sentence

that, as I interpret the Constitution of the United

States, it would be open to the Court to impose. I look

at the average sentences from the publicly-available

databases for sentences for this particular crime. I do

not sentence by any average or algorithm, rather I look

there to see what weight to be given to the now-advisory

sentencing guidelines. Finally I calculate accurately,

as I am required to by the law, the United States

sentencing guidelines.

If anyone would differ with any of the Court's calculations, I want you to interrupt me and we will try to resolve that issue.

Then we'll turn to the fourth and most important aspect of the proceeding, the -- to devise a fair and a just sentence in Ms. Zea's case. For that I'll hear the government, I'll hear defense counsel, and I'll hear

from Ms. Zea if she wishes to be heard from.

I neglected to say, or ask Mr. Kosto, do victims wish to be heard in this proceeding?

MR. KOSTO: They are here, your Honor, and they do wish to be heard, your Honor.

THE COURT: And that is their right and they may be heard and we'll do that after the arithmetic portion and prior to argument by counsel.

You should also understand that I have read all the papers in this case and, um, the government has made a certain motion in this case, that motion is allowed. That does not signal that the Court adopts the government's recommendation.

All right. With those matters stated, let me, um, first calculate the highest sentence, as I understand the Constitution of the United States, that the Court could impose in this case, and that sentence is the top of the applicable guideline without regard to any mitigating factors.

So I have to look at the sentencing guidelines to begin here and, um, here, um, starting on Page 24 of the presentence report, I must look to the sentencing guidelines -- and so if I discount anything that goes to mitigate the sentence, in Count 1 the base offense level is 18, I add two levels because of the pattern of

activity involving stalking, threatening, harassing, actions against the same victim. At the moment we won't consider any adjustments downward for role in the offense. So that would take us to 20. And, um, I add another two levels for obstruction of justice, and that takes us to 22.

As to, um, the conspiracy, that's, um -- without an adjustment that is also a 20 -- not also a 20, the first is 22, and the greater of the two-above levels is 22. Let me ask the probation for help here.

So I'm not taking into account anything that would mitigate that sentence. So what is the grouping rule if one is at a 22 and the other is at a 20?

PROBATION OFFICER: So what I'm looking at, your Honor, is two separate groups because there's two separate victims --

THE COURT: Understood.

PROBATION OFFICER: -- and they have the same base offense level of 18. And then if you look at Paragraph 157, it explains that they both come out to the adjusted offense level of 20, they're both assigned one unit, um --

THE COURT: But if I don't mitigate it, that's what I'm looking at now, they're at 22, is that not so? And that would take us to 24 then.

(Silence.)

THE COURT: Mr. Kosto?

MR. KOSTO: Consistent with the Court's practice, if the Court takes the adjusted offense level in the presentence report of 22, removes the benefit of the minor role adjustment, and removes the typical benefit afforded to a guilty plea, what the Court would have is an offense level for these purposes of 27 and a guidelines range of 70 to 87 months.

THE COURT: Thank you, that's exactly what I wanted to -- I at least wanted the calculation.

And therefore the -- an therefore the, um -- the highest sentence the Court could impose upon these two counts statutorily is 5 years, but I could go up to 87 months under the Constitution, um, making one of the sentences consecutive. All right.

Actually if we look at the publicly-available databases, there is no statistically-significant group of sentences upon which the United States Sentencing Commission nationwide can advise as to average sentences, and the only times this Court has sentenced for this crime is in this particular case. I've never faced these crimes before having the responsibility of sentencing in this particular case. So really there's no average to calculate.

The Court now turns to accurately calculating the sentencing guidelines, and I express my thanks to the probation officer here, and we'll take the Victim 1 first, um, though there are two groups.

The base offense level is 18. As I said, I add two levels because of the pattern of activity. Here I do conclude that Ms. Zea was a minor participant. I subtract two levels. I add in two levels for obstruction of justice. That gives us an 18.

For, um -- when I look at the, um, conspiracy, that's base offense level 18, I add two levels for the pattern, subtract the two levels for a minor participant, add in two levels for obstruction of justice, and for each of the victims the adjusted offense level is 20. Two units, brings us up to 22. I do go down three levels for the guilty plea. Taking us to an ultimately-adjusted offense level of 19, a criminal history category of 1.

So I am advised to, um -- though I can certainly take into account the government's motion, and I will, I'm advised to a sentencing range of not less than 30 nor more than 37 months, a period of supervised release of not less than 1 nor more than 3 years, a fine of not less than \$10,000, nor more than \$100,000, and there must be a special assessment of \$200.

```
1
           Are the guidelines, as a matter of arithmetic,
 2
     accurately calculated, Mr. Kosto?
 3
           MR. KOSTO: Yes, your Honor.
           THE COURT: Defense counsel?
 4
 5
           MR. UBHAUS: Yes, your Honor.
           THE COURT: That's the guideline calculation.
 6
 7
     will hear the victims.
           MR. KOSTO: Thank you, your Honor. David and Ina
8
     Steiner would each like to address the Court.
 9
10
           THE COURT: And they both may.
11
           MS. STEINER: Thank you, your Honor.
12
           Can you hear me okay?
13
           THE COURT: I can hear fine. Thank you.
14
           MS. STEINER: My name is Ina Steiner, I am Victim
15
     1.
16
           Defendant Veronica Zea joined ebay's security
17
     department in May of 2017 as a contract worker.
     following year, ebay fired Concentric Advisors and hired
18
19
     "Progressive Force Concepts," known as "PFC," which
20
     continued to pay her salary while she was placed at
21
     ebay.
22
           PFC was a company well-known to defendants --
23
     co-defendants Jim Baugh and David Harville.
24
     Harville had collaborated with PFC in the design of a
25
     tactical knife that he promoted and sold on his website.
```

In fact, on August 20th, 2019, just days after returning to San Jose after Harville had surveilled David and me in Natick along with defendants Baugh and Zea, Harville promoted PFC in a social media post advertising the weapon.

Two years ago Defendant Zea told the New York

Times of the deeply-troubling work environment at ebay,

including a disturbing instance in which defendant Baugh

took a knife and stabbed a chair at ebay headquarters.

But Defendant Zea willfully turned a blind eye to those things. She told the Times her ambition was to be hired by ebay as an employee.

But ebay needed to retain some contract workers from PFC to finance the conspiracy.

The so-called "off-the-grid" expenditures used by the defendants to terrorize David and me were paid by defendant Zea's PFC-issued credit card.

Imagine how two companies, one a publicly-traded company, could finance a campaign the scope of this one that included lavish hotel rooms and Sunday morning brunches -- a \$255 funeral wreath, and live spiders and cockroaches, and have it all approved by ebay executives.

In a Power Point presentation ebay made to federal prosecutors in March 2021 in its efforts to avoid

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

prosecution, ebay cavalierly referred to PFC's financing as an "expensing loophole." Ebay has swept this troubling financing aspect under the rug as it has done with so many things regarding this case, when instead, it should disclose everything it knows. THE COURT: Ms. Steiner, I really want to hear everything you have to say, but you will understand that I have this individual here for whom it is my judicial responsibility to fashion a fair and a just individual sentence. Now I take very much into account the circumstances, all the circumstances, the others involved for whom she was working, what was done, but ebay is not a party to these proceedings, cannot be heard, and has not been heard in these proceedings. I'll hear you. Go ahead. MS. STEINER: Thank you, your Honor. It's, um -- it's difficult for us to separate --THE COURT: I'm not asking you to, I'm simply trying to understand my responsibility here today. There may be other proceedings. But that's not today. But go ahead. MS. STEINER: Should I change or --THE COURT: You may. You may go right ahead.

MS. STEINER: Okay. Thank you, your Honor.

I think that it's -- employees deserve this and the sellers who use the platform deserve this, and I think the shareholders deserve this. And I think David and I also have a right to answers about the crimes that have impacted our lives so significantly.

On August 20th, 2019, Zea answered her phone at the Ritz Carlton Hotel and told a Natick police detective she would join him in the lobby regarding the activity in Natick involving a car she had rented, but instead, she fled the hotel and immediately flew back home to California.

She had hours on the plane to reflect on what had happened. Instead of doing the right thing, she welcomed her co-conspirators' help as they coached her to lie to investigators.

Defendant Zea played an indispensable role in the terrorism campaign against us.

In its June 2020 affidavit, the government outlined the conspirators' plan to send gang members to our home.

Defendant Zea wrote in her sentencing memo, "Jim Baugh started to explain that defendant Brian Gilbert's recent trip to Southern California to speak with Samoan gang members were related to what we were doing. He said he had a backup plan to send "thugs" if needed.

How could a young woman be okay with listening as her co-defendants dreamed up schemes to send an ordinary middle-aged couple threatening deliveries? How was she okay with following them around town in rental cars she had reserved and paid for through PFC? And how could she be okay with sending gang members to their home?

Of course I'm also wondering how a former police captain could do such a vial and dangerous thing?

Defendant Brian Gilbert called me in August 2019 to offer assistance in a doxing and harassment campaign of his employer's making and attempted to ambush me at the Natick Police Department with false dossiers meant to look -- to make us look like a security threat.

We would also later learn that defendant Gilbert brushed past us in our driveway during our yard sale in June 2019 as he scoped out our property, two months before he and his colleagues would unleash their full-blown terrorism campaign against us.

My life will never be the same. Even mundane things I took for granted are no longer options, like holding the occasional yard sale. The thought of being alone at home at night still terrifies me.

As difficult as it is to come before a federal judge and attempt to explain how I was impacted, each time I appear brings me forward on a journey, though

there will never be a final destination called "normal."

By appearing in person before this Court, I can see the people who stalked me who otherwise would remain faceless names on a piece of paper, providing me some level of closure.

We are here because of something dark that happened in our lives. The courtroom is an opportunity to shed light on the darkness, as painful as it is, so we can all seek our way forward.

Thank you, your Honor. And I'd like to request that my victim statement be placed on the docket.

THE COURT: It may be. It will be received and docketed.

MS. STEINER: Thank you.

THE COURT: Mr. Steiner.

MR. STEINER: Thank you, your Honor.

If I could just preface this statement by saying that it's very difficult to separate what happened to us personally from what happened to us as journalists. So in that spirit, um, my name is David Steiner, I'm Victim Number 2.

In August 2019, Ina and I were frantic. Online threats and disturbing deliveries were coming at a rapid-fire pace. Our peaceful one-way street turned into a caravan of Natick police cruisers, responding to

incident after incident in our home. Neighbors were on edge, and after being tailed twice by strange vehicles in three days, I knew that whoever was threatening us online was now right outside our door. I had no doubt that Ina's life was in danger, and we were terrified.

We're grateful to the Natick Police Department and the FBI for taking our reports seriously, stopping the harassment and pursuing this case. We are also grateful to the U.S. Attorney's Office for taking the case as far as they have.

But on October 11th, this Court had it exactly right. This is bigger than what happened to Ina and me. This is broader than 7 defendants who have pled guilty to crimes related to cyberstalking and harassment. The Court's words that day resonated with me when it said, "This is one of the most important cases upon which this Court has every sat. The skills which defendants employed to go cyberstalking are an extreme danger, and when you put those skills to service of some large corporate entity with economic power to go after individuals and squash down their speech, we are all at risk. All of us."

And those words validated, finally, what Ina and I have been imploring the government to do for the better part of three years, to go deeper. We realized the

larger implication of this case within hours of discovering who was behind our cyberstalking and harassment.

Ebay's actions were a danger to the First Amendment.

But to date, the government has not moved beyond the 7 people who have pled guilty to these horrific crimes. According to ebay's own internal investigation, Steve Wymer, ebay's former chief communications officer, obstructed the investigation and destroyed evidence.

These were the same charges prosecuted successfully against some of the defendants. Why was Wymer not indicted? As we were told, sitting across the table from the U.S. Attorney, he refused to be interviewed by the FBI and the U.S. Attorney. Wymer has not been held accountable and now holds the position of CEO of the Boys and Girls Clubs of Silicon Valley.

So was former ebay CEO Devin Wenig and Wendy

Jones, who oversaw ebay's global intelligence. For

their participation and for creating the culture that

allowed this corporate terrorism to occur, they've been

rewarded with board seats.

As for defendant Zea, she was a contractor for Progressive Force Concepts and was placed at ebay. She was clearly in the middle of this conspiracy, which

would not have occurred without the financial backing provided by PFC. Zea's use of PFC funds to facilitate the deliveries, the flights to Boston, hotel rooms, lavish meals, and rental cars, all allowed the conspiracy to continue. When caught, she quickly tried to hide her trail online by taking down her LinkedIn profile, Facebook page, and Twitter account. She lied to investigators and obstructed authorities by destroying evidence.

Not only did she and her fellow conspirators do untold harm to a person I love dearly, but they also tried to silence our reporting. This is our livelihood. And in the process, assaulted the most important right a United States citizen is born with.

Ina's been portrayed in court filings in the media as a "blogger," or "ebay critic." She's a journalist.

A longtime member of both the Online News Association and Investigative Reporters and Editors. Her reporting has always been fair, balanced, well-researched, and an immeasurable help to ebay's own customers, the online sellers that fuel the marketplace's success. To try to stop her reporting is incomprehensible to me.

There are many casualties resulting from ebay's actions. 7 people have ruined their lives. Ebay's own customers, online sellers, have lost trust in the

company that they depend on for income. Our own emotional and financial security has been severely damaged. And this case has left me cynical about how our justice system works.

There's a separate justice for powerful people and mighty corporations. They can refuse to cooperate or hire outside counsel to "self-investigate" to avoid criminal prosecution. It's also not lost on me how many former prosecutors were involved in representing the defendants and how many we'll face on the civil side.

Last year, Andrew Lelling, the U.S. Attorney whose office charged this case against the 7 defendants did a podcast for his current employer in the private sector along with former Assistant U.S. Attorney Amy Burkhart. The topic of the podcast was, "The Ebay Cyberstalking case: Mitigating the Compliance Risks of Employee Misconduct." The two former prosecutors who led this case were now using our nightmare as a marketing tool to drum up corporate clients that might find themselves in the same position as ebay, and in need of a good experienced law firm.

The takeaway from me was, how hard is a prosecutor willing to go after a corporation when down the road they might be courting that same company for their business?

The First Amendment outlines our most precious right as a U.S. citizen. It's widely considered our most important constitutional right. A free press is a vital component to living in a free society. Without it there's no way to hold up truth to power.

Large powerful corporations should not be allowed to use their immense resources to intimidate, threaten, and silence reporters just because they don't like the message.

This is the sixth victim impact statement I've given in this case. The government has stated that this is an ongoing investigation. I have my doubts. Ina and I are more than willing to do what is required of us in the event this case is ever fully prosecuted. It's an obligation we feel deeply as citizens of this country and a responsibility we owe to other journalists.

To ignore the larger context of this case is to do so at our own peril.

I'd like to thank the Court for considering my words and also request my statement be placed on the docket.

THE COURT: It may be, and I thank you both.

MR. STEINER: Thank you.

THE COURT: All right. Now we'll turn to the fourth step and we'll start by hearing the government.

Mr. Kosto.

MR. KOSTO: Thank you, your Honor.

The United States, as mentioned in its memorandum, requests that the Court impose a sentence on Ms. Zea of 2 years probation concurrent on each count, with the first year of that sentence to be served in home confinement with the standard exception to permit work and religious observance and medical appointments and similar. That the Court impose a \$5,000 fine and the required \$200 special assessment.

As we described in our papers, your Honor, Ms. Zea is among the or the least culpable of participants in the conspiracy that's charged in the information in terms of her seniority at ebay, in terms of the actions that she took at the direction of others, in terms of having less visibility into the full scope of the activities that were directed at the Steiners that the Court has just heard about.

What I should say, however, your Honor, is that the victims in this case are sitting behind me, or were sitting behind me, they're not next to me. The defendant, whatever her work environment was at ebay, which the government's taken into account in its sentencing recommendation, um, is not a victim in this case, is someone who knowingly and willfully took part

in a campaign that is horrifying, and horrifying for the reasons Mr. Steiner very eloquently articulated, but horrifying objectively on the facts of what was arriving there in boxes and what was arriving on their doorstep. But for the motion that the government filed in this case, the government would be seeking a term of imprisonment for Ms. Zea, as it would have for Mr. Stockwell and as it did for Ms. Popp, Mr. Cook, Mr. Baugh, and Mr. Harville.

The government submits that a custodial sentence, however in light of that motion, is not needed in this case to individually deter Ms. Zea, she's spoken at great length about the impact of this case on her in her submission attached to her sentencing letter, which is part of the docket, and the government credits her assessment and the defendant's assessment that it need not worry about individually deterring her.

Given the facts of the case, given the, um, seriousness of the offense, the government submits that some general deterrent component is necessary for this sentence even where there is no custodial term and that home confinement portion of the sentence both serves that term so that this is not a -- so that this has a going-forward affect on Ms. Zea's life, and also matches the sentence that the government requested and that the

Court imposed on Ms. Stockwell, who in the government's assessment was very similarly culpable in terms of her rank within the organization, and as the government suggested in its memo, this issue of relative power, um, and experience within the conspiracy.

The Court is familiar with the roles of former police officers and individuals with 20-plus years experience in the security industry, individuals who have worked in Fortune 500 corporations previously,

Mr. Baugh and Mr. Harville, um, Officers Cook and

Gilbert, who are both retired police captains, on the one hand, and defendants like Ms. Zea and Ms. Stockwell who were in their first jobs out of college with no relevant experience. It doesn't take these defendants outside the range of knowing and willful culpability for getting involved in something that was criminally beyond the line, but it mitigates the necessity for the imposition of as serious a sentence that others of the defendants have received in this case.

We take into account in our recommendation also the submissions from Ms. Zea's treating medical providers and in the government's assessment her medical and mental health did have a role in the decisions that she made to participate and then obstruct the investigation.

Unless the Court has any further questions, that's the reason for the recommendation here. We've spoken at great length about the seriousness of the offense, we've agreed with the Court on the implications that this case has on First Amendment journalism, Mr. Steiner stated it as well as could be said. And that alone bespeaks the seriousness of the crime.

THE COURT: Thank you.

Mr. Ubhaus.

MR. UBHAUS: Yes, thank you, your Honor.

I think we have covered a lot of this ground in our sentencing memorandum --

THE COURT: Which I've read with care and you can be sure of that.

MR. UBHAUS: Yes, and I appreciate it, your Honor, and I appreciate it, as Ms. Zea appreciates the government's recommendation. We do take exception to the one year of home confinement, and I'll get to that in a moment.

As we've pointed out in our papers, Veronica Zea at 25 with no work experience started at ebay encumbered, as the government has recognized, encumbered by some severe mental, emotional, um, psychological issues, but she was full of enthusiasm, she believed this was the start of the work career that she really

wanted to have in law enforcement, um, had no experience, no -- now remarkably because of the some health issues, no experience in the work field, really at all, um, taking tickets at a carnival ride, um, and had nothing to compare it with. After when this all happened, she did get a job at Facebook for a while and realized there's a whole different way of doing these things.

Unfortunately she ended up in the security arena at ebay working for Jim Baugh. And when I got involved in this case, it was hard for me to believe, and I think it's been hard for everybody to believe that something like this could happen. I mean how in the world could a — as Mr. Kosto said, a Fortune 500 company, allow this to happen? They allowed it to happen because they had somebody like Jim Baugh in the position that he was in. And as I think it was Annalese Oleson's letter, which I've attached to my declaration, where she described what working in Jim Baugh's security department was like, and she described it as a "cult."

I think as the fellow who was the CEO of Concentric, after they had been fired by Jim Baugh, and he remarked I think in one of the sentencing memoranda, or actually in the news article that covered this, that he saw it as a cult. That he saw what Jim Baugh and the

others, Stephanie Popp and the others were doing, particularly to the young analysts, was conditioning them, and Veronica Zea was a perfect foil for that conditioning.

She was -- she was conditioned by Baugh to follow orders, and she was inclined to do that anyway, she was conditioned by Baugh and other executives at ebay -- and I certainly take the Steiners' comments to heart because I feel the same way about the responsibility of people at ebay, because this all came down from the top. And because it all came down from the top, it was believable.

It was believable that to somebody like Veronica
Zea, with her lack of experience, it was believable that
"Ecommerce Bites," the Steiners' newsletter, did in fact
-- at the beginning did in fact present a threat, that
it presented a threat to ebay itself, to the ebay
employees, to ebay executives. That's what Jim Baugh
conveyed -- and that's what was conveyed to him, but
that's what he conveyed to Veronica Zea and she bought
it, at least initially.

And it was sort of like cooking the fraud because I think the -- initially I think for Veronica she did the few things that Baugh asked her to do, and then realized over time that this was far worse than she had

ever realized. But at that point I think in her condition, in her state, she couldn't get out.

But she has -- her life has been literally torn apart by what happened here. As I said, she was a young woman with a promising future, she now has two federal felony convictions that will stick with her for the rest of her life.

She is saddled with guilt and remorse. I think as she conveyed in her submittal to the Court, and has been conveyed I think very very eloquently by all of the people who have written letters on her behalf, that she has been saddled with guilt and remorse for the last three years. She has -- the last three years effectively have been on home confinement.

She finally, after she lost her job at ebay, then she lost her job at Facebook when the criminal charges were filed, she was then unemployed for 8 months, living at home, and because of her condition, which has been described by a number of her family and friends, she really was unable to go out. The only job that she got was through a friend of her mother's, a woman who's a dean of Lincoln Law School, who I know, she got her a job as a clerical -- really just to help out, at \$25 an hour, and that's all she's been able to do for the last couple of years.

She has been -- and this is not in any way to belittle what the Steiners have suffered. I mean I can't even begin to imagine, nor can Veronica, what they've had to go through. And hopefully -- and it looks like this may be the last sentencing in this saga, that they can move on from here as well.

The -- my concern with the -- I will say that this is one of the most difficult cases in close to 50 years of experience that I've had. It's hard to understand how it happened. It's hard to understand a company like ebay. It's hard to understand how these young women got caught up in this, because we all agree that she shouldn't be here. But for the circumstances, a number of circumstances that we've outlined in our pleadings and the government has outlined, she wouldn't be here. This was not something she set out to do.

She needs the ability to get on with her life.

She has -- as I said, she has been -- she's been punished substantially. Not only the felony convictions, the lack of employment, the inability to go out and really engage with life for the last three years, but for her it's -- from this point going forward, it's starting over, and she's starting over carrying these two felony convictions with her.

And I submit, your Honor, that a year of home

confinement really doesn't -- I just don't -- I just don't believe that it is -- it is the just and fair sentence that the Court is looking for, given the circumstances, given what's happened to her, given her role in this offense, which is, as the probation office and the government recognizes, the least culpable of all the defendants. Having another year of home confinement will simply make it just that much more difficult for her to get out and get beyond this -- get beyond this nightmare.

So with that, your Honor, unless there are questions for me, Ms. Zea does wish to direct comments to the Court as well as to the Steiners.

THE COURT: And she may.

MR. UBHAUS: Thank you, your Honor.

THE COURT: Ms. Zea, you have the right to talk to me directly. You are not required to. But if you want to, I'll hear you now.

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, thank you, your Honor.

I'm sorry, I'm not usually emotional in front of others so this might, um, take me a minute.

I would like to begin by saying how sorry I am.

I've spent a lot of time about worrying about how to convey the full depths of my grief over this, and if I may I'd like to address Mr. and Mrs. Steiner directly?

THE COURT: You may.

THE DEFENDANT: (Turns to Steiners.) I'm sorry.

I'm sorry I played a role in hurting you.

(Pulls microphone closer.)

Oh, thank you. I'm a soft speaker. It haunts me daily. I would like to give you some context on my involvement because for a few years now I've wanted to apologize and to give you a better understanding on at least one of the people involved in what is being referred to as "The campaign."

I was not an eager participant in what occurred, I was not laughing or scheming behind the scenes, I was terrified, um, but I was not brave enough to remove myself from the situation and continue to follow Baugh's instructions.

I have PTSD. I can't sleep. When I do, I regularly wake up in a cold sweat from nightmares. I don't trust anyone new. I've lost chunks of my hair and the ability to cook for myself and have had chronic back and chest pains since the beginning of the year, the weight of the guilt physically weighing me down, and many other things. I feel like I've died. I wouldn't wish it on anyone. And the fact that I likely only feel a fraction of the fear and stress that you have and that I played a part in causing it is killing me. I am so

deeply sorry. I do not expect forgiveness because I understand you not being able to forgive me. I don't think I will ever learn to do so myself.

(Turns back to court.)

Thank you. What I have learned is to understand my actions a little better. I know I should have said "No," I know that I should have trusted my instincts, and I knew then too, but I was so scared and felt so helpless. I didn't know how to remove myself from the situation.

I'm not trying to excuse my participation. I knew that it was wrong. I would just like to give some explanation in hoping that it can bring the Court some understanding and give the Steiners some information about at least one of the shadowy figures that partook in these actions.

When Baugh first told me that he wanted to send items to the Steiners, he explained it as a sort of reciprocation. He said the Steiners had a history of publishing private information about those who spoke publicly in favor of ebay.

He told me the items sent. Once he showed them how doxing impacted people, he said they'd be fully aware that the items were from ebay and that they wouldn't be scared because they would not expect it.

think he just knew how to keep me going along.

But once it became clear that his actions were far more nefarious, I was desperate to leave, but the way my brain works I couldn't comprehend jumping without the safety net of another job, and I was threatened many times when it seemed that I was looking elsewhere for employment.

So I stayed and things got worse. I witnessed him and others say and do things far beyond my comfort level. My brain started to work kind of like an optical illusion, I was bending my perception of reality to compensate what I was really seeing, like how our brains sometimes rewire a memory to try to protect us from how awful it was. My brain was doing that in real-time.

Baugh told me that he would destroy anyone that ruined his operation. He let me know that I now had too much, quote, unquote, "skin in the game to quit," that he would destroy my life and those of others around me. That if he went down for anything, he would be sure to bring me down with him. I again believed him and felt scared for my family and myself. I put our safety over the Steiners and I regret it to this day.

I feared for myself but I also feared for the three analysts younger than me in the unit. I felt a sense of protection over them like I needed to protect

them from the dangers of Baugh. I regret that I failed to get help from higher-ups because I thought they were involved in all of this too. I failed to ensure things were prevented from that point on.

I spent my time in Massachusetts scared out of my mind with panic attacks. It was the worst week of my life. I was used as a tool for evil and I regret it every day and I hate myself for it.

I seem to see Baugh everywhere I go, most days it's like I can hear him calling me terrible names still whenever I make a slight error. I can't shake the feeling that he's watching me. I physically run away from men that bear a likeness to him. I flinch every time I see a car that looks like his.

It wasn't until my first proffer with AUSAs that it really dawned on me that there was this First Amendment root of this all, the First Amendment right. Baugh told me we were sending items to send a message. He said we needed to determine if the Steiners were being paid by new members of the board to influence the stock. He told me it was illegal and we needed to take evidence to the police.

I know I should have seen through it, but I was too trusting. I didn't realize until it was far too late that his ultimate goal was to have it all taken

down. I'm so sorry that I was included in all of this to not respect one of the most precious of human rights. For that I also apologize.

I was scared, I feared further mental and physical repercussions, and I simply didn't know how to remove myself. I'm working every day to build the skills to ensure this never happens again.

I so hope that when these sentencing hearings are all done, that the Steiners are able to feel some peace and some semblance of normal. I hope that I am able to get back -- to get some life back into myself and I can find the energy to again serve others. One of my strongest desires is to be able to help others.

The most important thing in my life to me is my family. My mom is one of my best friends. I want to thank her for being here with me today. I know it's not easy on her and my dad, my sister, and the rest of my family, as well as my boyfriend. I'm grateful every day that I have such amazing people in my life. I almost wish I didn't have such a support system because I don't feel like I deserve it.

The course of my life has changed mentally and permanently and I'm determined to find a path where I can do good moving forward.

Thank you.

(Pause.)

THE COURT: Ms. Veronica Zea, in consideration of the offenses of which you stand convicted, the information from the United States Attorney, your attorney, the probation office, and yourself, and pursuant to 18 United States Code Section 3553(a), this Court sentences you to 2 years of probation, the first 12 months of your probationary term will be served in home confinement. You may leave the home to work, for religious observances, you may leave for -- to consult with your attorney, for any medical appointments you may have, but other than that you will be in that home. The Court imposes upon you a \$5,000 fine. The Court imposes a special assessment, as it is required to, of \$200. The sentence on each count runs concurrent, one with the other.

Let me explain this sentence to you. I believe what you said to the Court, I believe that that accurately describes how you view what happened here, and I will say to you, and I have no hesitancy in saying, that it hurt me to hear you say that you do not deserve the support system that you have. That's not true, Ms. Zea. You do deserve it, because you are a human being with the rest of your life before you. And it need not -- it need not be defined by what has

happened here, and it's up to you to decide whether it will be so defined. But you do deserve the love and caring of all those people who care for you.

Let's be very clear though. You are guilty of these two crimes. You are not the only one that is guilty and my view is considerably different than yours, and I have no hesitancy in saying this. Your attorney — and he's done a fine, able, and professional job for you, he says "It's hard to believe that a company, publicly-traded such as this, could engage in such conduct." I've been privileged to serve as a judicial officer for 44 years. It is not hard to believe at all.

Who was it, Montesquieu, who said that "Power corrupts and absolute power corrupts absolutely"? We tolerate in this nation great aggregations of economic power. That power, it has been the experience of this Court, is sometimes abused. When it is abused, those who abuse it ought be brought to account. What I said and was referred to in an earlier sentencing is exactly the case. This is one of the most important -- your case, with this relatively light sentence, is one of the most important cases on which I have ever sat because it exemplifies, it's representative of the misuse of corporate economic power. You are a part of that. And it's for other proceedings to adjudicate the legal

responsibility, and I express no opinion. I have the responsibility for sentencing you. But it's not hard to believe.

And I struggle with how it can be, in your case, that you did not realize at the outset -- again your attorney argued this. I don't fault him for making the argument but it struck me that he said, "Well, you know, this came down from on top and at first it looked all right." It never looked all right. When did you learn about the First Amendment, isn't that something they taught before you got out of school? We're talking about speech. It is properly said that the First Amendment doesn't protect the speech that we like, that's easy, it protects the speech that we hate. You should have understood that. It is no excuse that this was your first job. And the implications of this case, this particular case, your case, resonate throughout the society.

I had another cite in the other -- one of the other sentencings, but I'll cite this that comes to mind. As I listen to you I think of President Reagan, he said this. "Freedom is a fragile thing, never more than one generation away from extinction. It must be fought for and defended in every generation for it comes but once to a people."

Now in that quote he uses the word "generation" two times and that includes your generation. Not just your parent's generation or my generation before that, that includes your generation. And when it came to you — and you are saddled with this, there's no getting around it, though I wish you — and I'm very sincere on this, the very best of life once you get this behind you, but you are saddled with the knowledge that when it came to you you did not fight for or defend the First Amendment for our Constitution, it seems that you did not even recognize it. That's extraordinarily sad.

This is a fair and a just sentence. You have the right to appeal from any findings or rulings the Court has made against you. Should you appeal and should your appeal be successful, in whole or in part and the case remanded, you'll be resentenced before another judge.

Mr. Ubhaus, if an appeal is decided upon, you want transcript, seek it from this session of the court because I'll turn it around right away.

Do you understand?

(Interruption by Clerk.)

THE COURT: Oh, the Clerk points out that I have not made mention of the conditions of probation. They are all the general conditions and the special conditions set forth in the presentence report. And I

```
thank the Clerk.
1
 2
           Mr. Ubhaus, you understand, if you want
 3
     transcript?
           MR. UBHAUS: Yes, no problem, your Honor.
 4
           THE COURT: Very well. That's the sentence of the
 5
     Court. We'll stand in recess.
 6
 7
           (Ends, 1:00 p.m.)
8
                      CERTIFICATE
9
10
11
           I, RICHARD H. ROMANOW, OFFICIAL COURT REPORTER, do
12
     hereby certify that the forgoing transcript of the
13
     record is a true and accurate transcription of my
14
     stenographic notes, before Judge William G. Young, on
15
     Thursday, November 3, 2022, to the best of my skill and
16
     ability.
17
18
19
20
     /s/ Richard H. Romanow 12-02-22
21
     RICHARD H. ROMANOW
22
                         Date
23
24
25
```